



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/443,202                                       | 11/18/1999  | GREGORY DAVID DOOLITTLE | EN999058                | 6901             |
| 7590 07/09/2004                                  |             | EXAMINER                |                         |                  |
| BLANCHE & SCHILLER ESQ<br>HESLIN & ROTHENBERG PC |             |                         | WILLETT, STEPHAN F      |                  |
| 5 COLUMBIA                                       |             |                         | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER   |                  |
| ALBANY, NY                                       | 122035160   |                         | 2141                    |                  |
|  |             |                         | DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |             |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/443,202   | DOOLITTLE ET AL.  |             |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |             |  |  |  |
|  | Stephan F Willett  | 2141  |             |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address   |             |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED on 5/28/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | PLY [check either a) or b)]  |   |             |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context o | divisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amothe shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extens unt of the fee. The appropriate extens originally set in the final Office action; | ion<br>sion |  |  |  |
| A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF)   | Brief must be filed within the pe  |   |             |  |  |  |
| 2. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b   | ,  |   |             |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>   | i better form for appeal by matel  | rially reducing or simplifying th   | e           |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| NOTE:  |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection  | •  |   |             |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | be allowable if submitted in a se  | parate, timely filed amendmen   | it          |  |  |  |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☑ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See   |  | dered but does NOT place the  |             |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | ause it is not directed SOLELY to  | o issues which were newly   |             |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we  |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: None.  |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: None.  |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,4,9-11,14-18,21,22,27,29,30,35</u>   | i-37,40-44,47,48,53-56,60,61,66-68   | 3,70-75,78 and 79.  |             |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |   |             |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr  | oved or b)☐ disapproved by th  | ne Examiner.  |             |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen   | t <u>(</u> s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   | ·   |             |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:   |  |   |             |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |             |  |  |  |
|  |  | •   |             |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |             |  |  |  |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The 112 rejections are withdrawn, except with regard to deadlock. The applicant's definition of deadlock "type" in light of "a finite number of threads" avaliable is not reasonable and is extrremly broad, as is the examiner's, based on one of ordinary skill in the art. The "thread pool management technique" described simply waits for the response to be processed by "a finite number of threads" and then the request can be processed by the same or a different "finite number of threads". Lastly, the "evaluation sequence" in Schoening does not mandate parameters from clients, similar to applicant's "receiving logic functions to schedule thread pools", pg. 4, lines 10-11, paper dated May 28, 2004. Note, is there scheduling or allocating? Further clarity is suggested in the claims in light of these comments, i.e. claims 1's "upon receipt of the request waiting on the response".

RUPAL DHARIA

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER